

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed on May 12, 2006, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration.

Claim(s) 1-31 are now pending in this Application.

Claim(s) 1, 15 and 29-31 are independent and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

In this Amendment, claim(s) 1, 2, 4-7, 12-16, 18 and 25-31 have been amended, claims 32-37 have been added and claim(s) 3 and 19-21 have been canceled. Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

**Formalities:**

The Office Action indicates informalities in the specification. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his observations. The indicated informalities have been corrected as per the specification amendments above. No new matter has been added.

The Application was considered informal because the Abstract exceeded 150 words in length. Applicant has amended the Abstract to cure this minor informality. The new, separately attached, substitute Abstract which replaces the originally filed Abstract includes 150 words or less and is separately attached.

**Drawings:**

The Office Action indicated some informalities with the Drawings. These informalities related to reference numerals which have been corrected as per the Specification amendments above.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112:**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 12-16, 18, 20-23 and 25-31 were rejected under **35 U.S.C. §112**. The above claim amendments correct these inconsistencies.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101:**

The Office Action rejects independent claims 15, 30 and 31 and related dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants have herein amended claims 15, 30 and 31 to recite an encoded set of processor based instructions and a processor responsive to the encoded set of processor based instructions, as discussed at page 7, lines 8-25 and page 18, line 12-page 19, line 12-25. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 has been overcome as it is requested that it be withdrawn.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Hefetz, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0123238:**

In general, Hefetz '238 discloses a WYSIWYG design approach that allows placeholders to switch between a representative display container that withholds runtime content, and the actual runtime content itself, as discussed at paragraphs 0039 and 41. Thus, Hefetz shows a system that bypasses actual dynamic content to facilitate a design effort, and then "switching on" the dynamic content at run time. In contrast, the present system employs a metadata representation including page descriptors that identify the format and position of dynamic content. In contrast to Hefetz, the present system does not require bypassing or placeholdering of runtime data for WYSIWYG screen editing purposes. Rather, the present system teaches metadata representation of dynamic content that differs from the Hefetz approach because no selection of runtime vs compile time entities is performed or required, in contrast to tag library selection by Hefetz at paragraph 0050. Thus, Hefetz provides a design editing tool, not a dynamic content metadata processing method.

With specific reference to the Office Action, the Office Action rejects claim 1 based on the proposition that Hefetz teaches generating the dynamic content. As

indicated above, generating the dynamic content includes referencing metalanguage representations of at least portions of other java server pages corresponding to the same rendered output report. Hefetz does not show, teach, or disclose such metalanguage references. Accordingly, claim 1 has been herein amended with the subject matter of claim 3 to recite referencing metalanguage representations of at least portions of other java server pages corresponding to the same rendered output report. The Office action suggests that Hefetz further teaches the subject matter of claim 3, however, the cited paragraphs 0056-0059 merely suggest third party toolkits (i.e. iViews, ILayoutStructure) for switching placeholder content to actual content, as discussed above. Claim 15, rejected on similar grounds, has been similarly amended.

Claims 1 and 15 have been further rejected based on the notion of generating dynamic content via fetching output data and processing display data. As indicated above, Hefetz merely selectively switches between placeholders and actual data, and makes no showing, teaching or suggestion of fetching output data and processing display data, as discussed in the specification at page 14, line 25-page 15-line 14. Hefetz merely invokes an external toolkit and makes no distinction or clarification concerning the claimed output data operable to be retrieved from a dynamic repository, and display data operable to indicate organization of the fetched output data. Claims 1 and 15 are therefore submitted as allowable.

Further, claim 15 has been herein amended with the subject matter of claims 19, 20, and 21, to now recite a syntax processor is further operable to process display data formatted according to a predetermined syntax, the predetermined syntax operable for parsing and verification of the display data,

the predetermined syntax being a different syntax than the template and generating further comprising interpreting the display data from the predetermined syntax into the syntax defining the template,

wherein the predetermined syntax includes syntactical elements, and is further operable for nesting the syntactical elements, the nested syntactical elements defining a hierarchical structure, to further clarify and distinguish claim 15.

With respect to the predetermined syntax, the Office Action suggests that Hefetz teaches such a predetermined syntax at paragraphs 0023-0026. However, the claimed predetermined syntax differs from Hefetz because the predetermined template need not be the same syntax (i.e. XML) as the template, a feature not shown or disclosed by Hefetz. The claimed metalanguage representations further comprise page descriptors operate as syntactic elements operable to define a hierarchical structure, as discussed at page 15, lines 15-27. Further, claims 32 and 33 have been herein added, to further clarify that the predetermined syntax comprise javabean components operable to interpret the predetermined syntax into the syntax of the output page, and that the syntax processor:

invokes the javabean components for each of the metadata components 32 to perform processing using the retrieved display data 58 and the output data,

generates the dynamic content 38 corresponding to each of the parsed metadata tokens, as discussed at page 15, lines 6-16 of the specification, and that the

javabeans interpret the predetermined XML compliant syntax of the metadata components for display on a user device, as disclosed at page 15, lines 17-19. Claims 34-37 have also been added to recite similar features with respect to claims 1 and 15, to further clarify and distinguish applicant's claimed invention.

Claim 29, rejected on grounds similar to claim 1, has been herein amended similarly to claims 1, 5 and 34.

Claim 30, rejected on grounds similar to claim 1, has been herein amended similarly to claims 1 and 15.

Claim 31, rejected on grounds similar to claim 1, has been herein amended with similarly to claims 1, 15 and 32, to further clarify and distinguish applicant's claimed invention, and is deemed allowable for the reasons given above.

-21-

As the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 15, which by the foregoing are deemed allowable, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No.: 44,883  
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC  
Westborough Office Park  
1700 West Park Drive  
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581  
Telephone: (508) 616-9660  
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: SUN03-12(0400436)

Dated: September 12, 2006